



PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION AND IT'S IMPORTANCE

Dr. Jakku Srinivasa Rao

Faculty, Dept. of Philosophy
Andhra University
Visakhapatnam

Introduction

Philosophy of education is a field characterized not only by broad theoretical [eclecticism](#) but also by a perennial dispute, which started in the mid-twentieth century, over what the scope and purposes of the discipline or even ought to be. During certain periods of the history of the philosophy of education, there have been dominant perspectives. At one time, the field was defined around canonical works on education by great philosophers ([Plato](#) of ancient Greece, the eighteenth-century, Swiss-born Frenchman Jean-Jacques Rousseau, and others); at other times, the field was dominated, in the United States at least, by John Dewey (1859 - 1952) and educational [Progressivism](#); at other times, the field was characterized by an [austere](#) analytical approach that explicitly rejected much of what had come before in the field as not even being proper “philosophy” at all.

But even during these periods of dominance there were sharp internal disputes within the field (such as feminist criticisms of the “Great Man” approach to philosophy of education and [vigorous](#) critiques of the analytical method). Such disputes can be read off the history of the professional societies, journals, and graduate programs that [institutionalize](#) the field, and they can be documented through a succession of previous encyclopedia articles, which by definition attempt to define and [delimit](#) their subject matter.¹

Philosophy of education is a field of [applied philosophy](#), drawing from the traditional fields of [philosophy](#) ([ontology](#), [ethics](#), [epistemology](#), etc.) and its approaches ([speculative philosophy](#), [prescriptive](#), and/or [analytic](#)) to address questions regarding [education policy](#), [human development](#), and [curriculum theory](#), to name a few. It might study what constitutes upbringing and education, the values and norms revealed through upbringing and educational practices, the limits and legitimization of education as an academic discipline, and the relation between educational theory and practice.²

Philosophy of education can be considered a branch of both philosophy and education. The multiple ways of conceiving education coupled with the multiple fields and approaches of philosophy make philosophy of education not only a very diverse field but also one that is not easily defined. Although there is overlap, philosophy of education should not be conflated with [educational theory](#), which is not defined specifically by the application of philosophy to questions in education.



Although philosophers around the world have asked questions regarding education for millennia, as an academic discipline with its own place in the university, it is relatively new. Nonetheless, it is an internationally well-established field, with departments and programs around the world. The expression “philosophy of”, when prefixed to the name of practice, denotes something which is some what, but not exactly like practice. ‘A philosophy of —’ (any practice) does have rules, but it is hard to say exactly what those rules are, once you get beyond the fundamental principles of ethics and logic. “It is defined by a purpose in which any one who wishes may join as a cooperative partner. It is an effort to discover the distinctive form which human reason assumes in that practice.”³

Philosophy of education is one of the oldest disciplines since Plato, who devoted momentous attention to the nature, purpose, and content of education. Philosophy of education began to emerge as a separate discipline only in the twentieth century. John Dewey, an American philosopher, who was born in Burlington, Vermont on October 20, 1859, was regarded as the foremost educator of his day and was considered as the first systematic thinker of philosophy of education. Since his time, it became an object of extensive study.⁴

All modern educationists hold the view that not only should educator be equipped with knowledge of a variety of subjects, but also that he should have his own philosophy of education, without which he cannot efficiently solve the problems that he faces in teaching from day-to-day life. Some people are impressed by the achievements of science that they give a higher place to science than philosophy in education. Psychologists are of the opinion that education should be based on psychological principles, while sociologists, impressed by the significance of social phenomena, suggest that education should be more influenced by their findings.

The basic purposes of life and the nature of the educand will be derived from the field of general philosophy, but the aims, the curriculum, administrative policies, means of evaluation and methods of teaching of educational institutions will be left to the educational experts. In the words of John Dewey: “Philosophy of education is not an external application of ready-made ideas to a system of practice having a radically different origin and purpose; it is only an explicit formulation of the problems of the formation of right mental and moral habitudes in respect to the difficulties of contemporary social life. The most penetrating definition of philosophy which can be given is, then, that it is the theory of education in its most general phase.”⁵

The philosophy of education properly conceived, does not just discuss philosophical problems in general, perhaps in the presence of educators and teachers; it discusses philosophical problems involving a particular topic namely education. During much of this century, the philosophy of education was represented as a part or offshoot of metaphysics and epistemology. Metaphysics is the branch of philosophy that deals with questions about reality – what things are real and how they are related to one



another – and – epistemology, the branch that deals with questions about nature and extent of our knowledge and about the definition and tests of meaning and truth. “Thus, it was thought that philosophers of education should be classified according to their theories of reality and knowledge.”⁶

The aim of education is a significant factor in the field of education. This question raises queries about the nature of man and the possibility of its modification and transformation. Man’s nature is very much concerned with his place in the cosmos. Therefore, the question of the aim of education is very much concerned with the question of the nature of the universe. Education is based upon the distinctions between animal and human nature. It has generally aimed to develop the characteristics peculiar to man. Robert R. Rusk points out: “Those powers and their products are peculiar to man, and differentiate him from other animals. They lie beyond the range of the positive science – biological and even psychological; they raise problems which only philosophy can hope to solve and make the only satisfactory basis of education a philosophical one.”⁷

The view that general philosophy bears little or no relationship to the educational enterprise admits that philosophy may be of service to education in clarifying the language used and in pointing out underlying assumption of certain beliefs expressed in educational literature. General philosophy has no direct bearing on the choice of educational principles or practices or on the acceptance or rejection of theories developed within the field of education.

Philosophy of Education in the West:

The western educational philosophers have generally agreed that free growth of the human child is the essence of education. In the words of A.G.Hughes, “The essence of discipline is, thus not forced subordination to the will of hated tyrants, but submission to the example of admired superiors.”⁸

Educational thinking, like every other branch of knowledge, started in the philosophical deliberation of the ancient Greek philosophers. The meaning of education in West is initially available in the works of Plato. It is interesting to note that thousands of years ago Plato gave a meaning to education which is even now followed in the West with slight changes.

Plato is the earliest important educational thinker. He saw education as the key to creating and sustaining his *Republic*. He advocated extreme methods: removing children from their mothers’ care and raising them as wards of the state, with great care being taken to differentiate children suitable to the various castes, the highest receiving the most education, so that they could act as guardians of the city and care for the less able. Education would be holistic, including facts, skills, physical discipline, and music and art, which he considered the highest form of endeavor. To know the nature of man is to know the nature of education. Plato applied this dictum in developing his educational philosophy as he is very clear in his description of human nature.



According to Plato: "The highest faculty of man, reason, is rooted in the spiritual soul."⁹

For Plato the individual was best served by being subordinated to a just society. Plato's belief that talent was distributed non-genetically and thus must be found in children born in any social class. His belief moves us away from aristocracy as a political system. He builds on this by insisting that those suitably gifted are to be trained by the state so that they may be qualified to assume the role of a ruling class. What this establishes is essentially a system of selective public education premised on the assumption that an educated minority of the population are, by virtue of their education (and inborn educability), sufficient for healthy governance. Today's tracking systems could be justified with Plato's ideas.

Plato should be considered foundational for democratic philosophies of education both because later key thinkers treat him as such, and because, while Plato's methods are autocratic and his motives leaned toward a meritocracy, he nonetheless prefigures much later democratic philosophy of education. This is different in degree rather than kind from most versions of, say, the American experiment with democratic education, which has usually assumed that only some students should be educated to the fullest, while others may, acceptably, fall by the wayside.

The educationally significant aspect of Plato's theory of Ideas lies in the actual educational practices derived from it. Ideas constitute the important content of education. Man's superior faculties are attributed to the soul (mind and reason) and inferior attributes to the body (evil, change, corruption, and the like). "The things of the mind are the concern of education. Other activities belong to man's lower nature and should not be dignified by the term education. They should be called training, in the sense that one speaks of training an animal."¹⁰

Plato with aristocratic preferences maintained that only those with the highest intellectual abilities can be considered fit to be rulers and those with less ability should be the guardians of the state, who can use their more limited intelligence as warriors, those with the lowest mental ability are expected to use what little intelligence they have as workers or providers for the two higher classes and for themselves. "Those with great intellectual ability should be placed in position of leadership; the rest of the soldiers must be habituated to following their leaders blindly."¹¹

Plato's writings contain some of the following ideas: Elementary education would be confined to the guardian class till the age of 18, followed by two years of compulsory military training and then by higher education for those who qualified. While elementary education made the soul responsive to the environment, higher education helped the soul to search for truth which illuminated it. Both boys and girls got the same kind of education. Elementary education consisted of music and gymnastics, designed to train and blend gentle and fierce qualities in the individual and create a harmonious person.

At the age of 20, a selection was made. The best one would take an advanced



course in mathematics, geometry, astronomy and harmonics. The first course in the scheme of higher education would last for ten years. It would be for those who had a flair for science. At the age of 30 there would be another selection; those who qualified would study dialectics and metaphysics, logic and philosophy for the next five years. They would study the idea of good and first principles of being. After accepting junior positions in the army for 15 years, a man would have completed his theoretical and practical education by the age of 50. Plato used the term education in a very wide sense: "Education makes a man eagerly pursue the ideal perfection of citizenship and teaches him how rightly to rule and how to obey."¹²

Aims of Education:

The widely accepted meaning of education in the West is Plato's humanist definition which includes a method of including values of life. As Plato said: "Now, I mean by education that training which is given by suitable habits to the first instincts of virtue in children."¹³

Based upon the above philosophical views, the aims of education might be expressed as 1) the pursuit of Truth, 2) the development of the mind, 3) the development of character, and 4) the sorting of students into social classes based upon the predispositions of their souls. A platonic curriculum would place the highest emphasis on those studies that develop reasoning skills and lift one's thoughts above the everyday world. Hence, platonic curricula have tended to emphasize the humanities and mathematics. They have placed substantially less emphasis on physical education, the natural sciences, and vocational studies, because all of these are rooted in the physical world rather than the world of ideas.

He advocated a radical equality of opportunity when he pointed up that a golden parent will sometimes have a silver son and vice versa. All that children of all the people are in the same manpower pool from which the rulers will be selected.¹⁴ "Art is not an essential activity of man according to Plato. It gives pleasure and recreation and it affords the tired mind. For this reason it must be controlled by the authorities. Art can never be permitted to become a vehicle for dissemination of evil."¹⁵

Plato set several specific goals for the lower schools. The first is the determination of the intellectual level of all children to identify those with superior ability. While accomplishing this goal the school also should give all children minimum training in the basic skills.¹⁶ Plato defined education as a life long process starting from the first years of childhood and lasting to the very end of the life."¹⁷ Education not only provides knowledge and skills but also inculcates values, training of instincts, fostering right attitudes and habits. In Republic, Plato points out: "That true education, whenever that may be, will have the greatest tendency to civilize and humanize them in their relation to another and to those who are under their protection."¹⁸



Aristotle:

Aristotle placed great emphasis on balancing the theoretical and practical aspects of subjects taught. Subjects he explicitly mentions as being important included reading, writing and mathematics; music; physical education; literature and history; and a wide range of sciences. He also mentioned the importance of play.

One of education's primary missions for Aristotle, perhaps it's most important, was to produce good and virtuous citizens for the polis. All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth.

Aristotle considered human nature, **habit** and **reason** to be equally important forces to be cultivated in education. Thus, for example, he considered repetition to be a key tool to develop good habits. The teacher was to lead the student systematically. Aristotle placed great emphasis on balancing the theoretical and practical aspects of subjects taught. "Subjects he explicitly mentions as being important included reading, writing and mathematics; music; physical education; literature and history; and a wide range of sciences. He also mentioned the importance of play."¹⁹

One of education's primary missions for Aristotle, perhaps it's most important, was to produce good and virtuous citizens for the polis. All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of empires depends on the education of youth. Aristotle's curriculum follows Platonic lines, with the early years of formal education devoted to reading, writing, arithmetic, geometry astronomy, music, civics, physical education. Although Aristotle admitted that these subjects had practical value for life, he insisted that knowledge acquired through them is good in itself and is necessary for intellectual perfection. "Purely utilitarian knowledge is "unsuited to men that are great-souled and free."²⁰

Education has been defined differently by the idealists, the pragmatists, the naturalists and the realist philosophers. However, its meaning has been generally idealistic. Without some sort of idealism there can be no education worth the name. John Dewey is acclaimed as the greatest educational thinker of the 20th century. His theory of experience continues to be much read and discussed not only within education, but also in psychology and philosophy. Dewey's views continue to strongly influence the design of innovative educational approaches, such as in outdoor education, adult training, and **experiential therapies**. "John Dewey put it in the opening chapter of his classic work *Democracy and Education*. In its broadest sense education is the means of the "social continuity of life."²¹

Dewey pointed out that the "primary ineluctable facts of the birth and death of each one of the constituent members in a social group" make education a necessity, for despite this biological inevitability the life of the group goes on. The great social importance of education is underscored, too, by the fact that when a society is shaken by a crisis, this often is taken as a sign of educational breakdown; education, and



educators, become scapegoats. According to John Dewey: "Education was show to be a process of renewal of the meanings of experience through a process of transmission, partly incidental to the ordinary companionship or intercourse of adults and youth, partly deliberately instituted to effect social continuity. This process was seen to involve control land growth of both the immature individual and the group in which he lives."²²

He pointed out that the authoritarian, strict, pre-ordained knowledge approach of modern traditional education was too concerned with delivering knowledge, and not enough with understanding students' actual experiences. Dewey became the champion, or philosophical father of experiential education or as it was then referred to, progressive education. But he was also critical of completely "free, student-driven" education because students often don't know how to structure their own learning experiences for maximum benefit.

John Dewey stressed that an educator must take into account the unique differences between each student. Each person is different genetically and in terms of past experiences. Even when a standard curriculum is presented using established pedagogical methods, each student will have a different quality of experience.

Dewey never gave importance to rote memorization of facts, formulae, or mere job training. He did not mean that educators should ignore issues of social control and classroom discipline or the control implicitly contained in the academic disciplines and skilled practices. According to him freedom implies negative freedom, or freedom from constraint, as well as positive freedom, or freedom for something, some value, some goal. Freedom for requires personal discipline. His 1938 *Experience and Education* was written to correct the excesses of those progressive educators who seemed to think "almost any kind of spontaneous activity inevitably secures the desired or desirable training of mental power"²³

For Dewey, education has also a broader social purpose, which was to help people become more effective members of democratic society. Dewey argued that the one-way delivery style of authoritarian schooling does not provide a good model for life in democratic society. Instead, students need educational experiences which enable them to become valued, equal, and responsible members of society. Dewey proposed that education be designed on the basis of a theory of experience. We must understand the nature of how humans have the experiences they do, in order to design effective education. In this respect, Dewey's theory of experience rested on two central tenets, continuity and interaction. Philosophy of education is theoretical that aims at the guidance to practice and experience. Dewey insisted that: "Wisdom is not "systematic and proved knowledge of fact and truth, but a conviction about moral values . . . [It] refers not to the constitution of things already in existence. But to a desired future which our desires, when translated into articulate conviction, may help bring into existence"²⁴



Jean Jacques Rousseau also had a different theory of human development. He held that there was one developmental process common to all humans. This was an intrinsic, natural process, of which the primary behavioral manifestation was curiosity. Rousseau wrote in his book *Emile* that all children are perfectly designed organisms, ready to learn from their surroundings so as to grow into virtuous adults, but due to the malign influence of corrupt society, they often fail to do so. Rousseau advocated an educational method which consisted of removing the child from society—for example, to a country home and alternately conditioning him through changes to environment and setting traps and puzzles for him to solve or overcome. Plants are shaped by cultivation and men by education. “We are born weak, we need strength; we are born totally unprovided, we need aid; we are born stupid, we need judgment. Everything we do not have at our birth and which we need when we are grown is given us by education.”²⁵

Rousseau was unusual in that he recognized and addressed the potential of a problem of legitimation for teaching. He advocated that adults always be truthful with children, and in particular that they never hide the fact that the basis for their authority in teaching was purely one of physical coercion: “I’m bigger than you.” Once children reached the age of reason, at about 12, they would be engaged as free individuals in the ongoing process of their own.

The principles of liberty have found most eloquent expression in the definition of education. Rousseau said: “Let us obey the call of Nature. We shall see that her yoke is easy and that when we give heed to her voice we find the joy in the answer of a good conscience.”²⁶

Rousseau emphasized the development of the natural faculties of man and paid little attention to the supernatural forces supposedly rooted in a spiritual soul. Francis Bacon proposed a new method (*novum organum*) which he believed enable man to divest himself of the falsehoods and idols which reason and faith had created.²⁷ The educational principles developed by Rousseau and Dewey, and numerous educational theorists and philosophers in the interregnum, are alive and well in the twenty-first century. Of particular contemporary interest is the evolution that has occurred of the progressive idea that each student is an active learner who is pursuing his or her own individual educational path.

By incorporating elements of the classical empiricist epistemology of John Locke, this progressive principle has become transformed into the extremely popular position known as constructivism, according to which each student in a classroom constructs his or her own individual body of understandings even when all in the group are given what appears to be the same stimulus or educational experience. There is also a solipsistic element here, for constructivists also believe that none of us—teachers included—can directly access the bodies of understandings of anyone else; each of us is imprisoned in a world of our own making. It is an understatement to say that this poses great difficulties for the teacher: “The education journals of the past two decades contain many thousands of references to discussions of this position, which elsewhere



I claimed has become a type of educational “secular religion”; for reasons that are hard to discern it is particularly influential in mathematics and science education.”²⁸

Education is the process of development and becomes necessary to discover what is implied in this development. Although the ability to learn depends upon development, but development is not synonymous with education. Development means the gradual and continuous progress of mind and body. The development of elements begins at home itself. The educator’s task is to continue this process and to encourage it while the child is at school.

In its general sense education continues throughout a man’s natural span of life. Even the successful teacher or educator himself remains a student through his life. On the one hand he teaches certain things to some people but at the same time he learns something from them. All successful educators experience that the development undergone by this thoughts, personalities and abilities would have been impossible otherwise. In much the same way, people other than the educators, teach and learn simultaneously.

Education in India:

The spiritual tradition has been carried on by contemporary Indian philosophers of education in their integral approach, synthesis of idealism and pragmatism, rationalism and humanism, diversity in unity and harmony of the individual and society. In the words of A.S. Altekar: “Education has always been regarded in India as a source of illumination and power which transforms and ennobles our nature by the progressive and harmonious development of our physical, mental, intellectual and spiritual powers and faculties.”²⁹

Indian philosophy of education is rooted in Indian culture. The basic characteristic of Indian culture is an integral approach to life. Therefore, only an integral philosophy of education can suit Indian society. Indian philosophers have interpreted human nature as essentially good and divine. They have considered liberation as the goal of life. To them spiritual level is the highest level of development. The microcosm and macrocosm have been interpreted identically. In human nature itself the Indian psychologist has always kept his eye on totality including physical, mentally and spiritual aspects. He has always aimed at integral personality. The development of other secular subjects like Economics, Politics, Arithmetic’s, Physical Sciences could not dominate or even affect the field of religion and philosophy. J.N. Mukerji says: “The whole educational system was saturated with religious ideals which influenced the aim, the contents of study and even the daily life of pupils. This knowledge was acquired through religion and as religious obligations”.³⁰

Indian philosophy of education is a cordial synthesis of idealism and pragmatism. While laying emphasis upon the cosmic, the universal and the total truth and reality, Indian thinkers have recognized the value of plurality, multiplicity and individuality as equally important expressions of the ultimate reality. Therefore, a philosophy of



education integral in aims, curriculum, psychology, practice, teaching methods and means of education will alone suit Indian society.

Education in human life such as development of natural abilities, character building, personality integration, preparation for adult life, control and sublimation of basic instincts, education for useful citizenship, development of a sense of community, a progress of culture and civilization, social welfare, use of leisure and the synthesis of national as well as international consciousness. The aim of education must be integral. It is a common agreement among all the Indian philosophers. The more comprehensive and integral aim of education is the better education. There is should be all round development of all the educands irrespective of caste, creed, race, sex, social or economic status, etc.

Contemporary Indian philosophers of education worshipped the nation and yet in a true humanist spirit they everywhere supported international contact and co-operation. In order to humanize contemporary education, the humanist values were given the most prominent place in every field of education, aims, agencies, curriculum, teacher's training, teaching methods and techniques, school management and evaluation and measurement, etc. Everywhere the all round development of each educand was the aim of the educator. To achieve this proper environment should be created in which the educators may also develop humane character and high human values. It is only then that they can present examples before the educands.

The suggestions advanced by contemporary Indian philosophers of education, including Sri Aurobindo, Swami Vivekananda, Rabindranath Tagore, M.K.Gandhi and Swami Dayananda will be most useful for formulating such a scheme of national education. Indian philosophers have laid emphasis upon spiritual values in human life. These spiritual values make men characteristically humane. Therefore, these values must find place in our scheme of humanization of contemporary education. It can be said without exaggeration that the philosophy of education maintained by these philosophers alone can supply the fundamentals for a humanist education In India.

In understanding the definition of science we are required to understand not only scientific method but also scientific attitude, scientific process, scientific problems and scientific conclusions because all these together form a science. According to Niranjana Das: "It is accepted that at all times and places an individual is imbibing some education. Education is not limited merely to the classroom. It can be obtained from all individuals, even from Nature. Considered from this standpoint, it can be said that the child gets education not only from his teacher but also from the entire complexity of his environment, each object in which is a means of educating him. It must be granted that, with this definition, the subjects of education cannot be determined, for they are far too numerous. Education is, therefore, also not limited to students but comprehends all human individuals, of all sizes and ages, races and groups."³¹

Education is informal, besides this aspect of education has great importance.



Such an education is not planned or organized. The child learns many new and interesting things from his parents, his friends at play, his neighbors and other members of society. Many things he can learn merely by observing others. It should not be concluded from this description that the restricted and the liberal, or the formal and the informal implications of education are mutually exclusive. In fact, the term education is used in both these senses. Education in both its forms is essential for a complete development of the individual. An individual who is formally educated is not necessarily completely developed, but he is unquestionably better informed than the average uneducated person. Besides, he develops the ability to imbibe education, as it is meant in its more liberal sense and essential. In the words of Robert R. Rusk: "We may accept that the aim of education is the enhancement or enrichment of personality, the differentiating feature of which is the embodiment of universal values."³²

Philosophy of education has produced many approaches to the subject. Some widely used texts present the basic philosophical presuppositions, or assumptions, in the areas of metaphysics, epistemology and axiology for each of the philosophical systems, such as realism, idealism, and pragmatism. This statement of philosophical beliefs is followed by a discourse on the implications of such beliefs for the aims of education, its nature and content, as well as other areas of educational concern. Another approach centers the discussion on major topics or problems in education, such as the pupil, aims curriculum, evaluation, discipline, and the like. Each of these topics then is viewed from the varied philosophical perspectives.

Education in human life such as development of natural abilities, character building, personality integration, preparation for adult life, control and sublimation of basic instincts, education for useful citizenship, development of a sense of community, a progress of culture and civilization, social welfare, use of leisure and the synthesis of national as well as international consciousness.

It is thus an overview of how the field of philosophy of education has seen itself, and it has recounted major elements in the narratives by which the history of the field has been traced by others. At the same time it has tried to reveal problems with the ways in which these different accounts have been driven in part by various agendas to define a scope and boundary for the field, and often to privilege one or another approach to philosophy of education, even when they have endeavored to be comprehensive and fair to all views.

This entry has taken a different approach, first, by resisting the [temptation](#) to provide a single definition or characterization of the field; and, second, by stressing not schools of thought or methodological divisions as the categories for thinking about the field, but rather the underlying inclinations, or impulses, that animate philosophical inquiry. As noted, for a field that tends to resist and argue over every attempt to define it, such caution is probably [prudent](#), but it has an added benefit as well. When philosophers think about the impulses that motivate their areas of inquiry and ways of thinking about them, they relate their philosophical work not solely to an abstract order of truth



but to themselves; and it is a short step from that recognition to extending that way of thinking to others as well. The generosity of outlook that results might be the one thing that all philosophers of education can share.

REFERENCES

1. Education Encyclopedia, Philosophy of Education Current Trends.
2. James Joseph, A New History of Educational Philosophy, p. 45.
3. James, E. McClellan., Philosophy of Education, p. 3.
4. James Joseph, A New History of Educational Philosophy, p. 52.
5. Dewey, John., Democracy and Education, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education, p. 331.
6. William K. Frankina, Philosophy of Education, p. 1.
7. Rusk, R.R., The Philosophical Bases of Education, p. 150.
8. Hughes, A.G., Education and the Democratic Ideal, p. 92.
9. Plato., Laws, X, 892.
10. Plato., Laws, I, 643.
11. Plato., Republic, ii, Jowette, 374.
12. Plato., Laws, Jowett, 644.
13. Ibid., 653.
14. Plato., Republic ii, 415.
15. Plato., Republic ii, Jowett, 377.
16. Plato., Laws, ii, Jowett, 809.
17. Plato., Protagoras, Jowett, 325.
18. Plato., Republic, jowett, 416.
19. Aristotle., Politics, vii, 645.
20. Aristotle., Politics, vii, 645.
21. Dewey, John., Democracy And Education, An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education, p. 3.
22. Ibid, p. 322.
23. Dewey, john, The Collected Works of john Dewey. Ed, Jo Ann Boydston, The later Works, 8, p. 153.
24. Dewey, john, The Collected Works of john Dewey. Ed, Jo Ann Boydston, Middle Works, 11, p. 44.
25. Rousseau., J.J. Emile, 251.
26. Ibid, p. 251.

+

+



27. Francis Bacon., 'Novam Organum', The works of Francis Bacon, ed, R.L., Ellis, p. viii, LXiii.
28. Phillips, D.C., Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Mon, Jun 2, 2008.
29. Altekar, A.S., Education in Ancient India, p. 8.
30. S.N. Mukerji, Education in India: Today and Tomorrow, 1960, p. 4.
31. Niranjana Das., Global Education, p. 27.
32. Rusk, R.R., The Philosophical Bases of Education, p. 154.

+

+